

## DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM

The 5th September, 1975

No. 5709-6PP-75/26559.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land specified below is needed by the Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, for setting up a tourist complex at village Ottu, Hadbast No. 139, tehsil Sirsa and district Hissar, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality specified below is likely to be required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for the information of all to whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana hereby authorises the officers with their servants and workmen for the time being engaged in the undertaking to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested, who has any objection, to the acquisition of any land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of this notification, file objection if any in writing before the Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil) Sirsa, district Hissar.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the office of the Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Sirsa, district Hissar and the Director Tourism, Hissar, Chandigarh.

## SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Village and H.B. No.	Total Area K. M.	Khasra Nos.	Area K. M.
Hissar	Sirsa	Ottu/139	72—0	211/1 211/2	1—7 70—13

ASHOK PAHWA,  
Director and Dy. Secy.

## LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 26th August, 1975

No. 9555-4Lah-75/26773.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Shri Panna Lal, Contractor, Sugar Mills, Yamuna Nagar.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 17 of 1975  
between

SHRI DEV NATH AND THE MANAGEMENT OF SHRI PANNA LAL, CONTRACTOR,  
SUGAR MILLS, YAMUNA NAGAR

Present :—

Shri Panna Lal, for the management.

Nemo, for the workman.

## AWARD

By order No. ID/Amb/372-A-75/16101-5, dated 18th March, 1975, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of Shri Panna Lal, Contractor, Sugar Mills, Yamuna Nagar and its workman Shri Dev Nath was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Dev Nath was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

Usual notices of the reference being served on the parties, Shri Panna Lal respondent appeared before me on 11th August, 1975. The workman however, did not appear despite being personally served of the notice of the reference, — *vide* registered post. His absence indicate that he is not interested in pursuing the demand made by him on the management, in respect of the illegality of the termination of his services.

Shri Panna Lal relies on written settlement alleged to have been arrived at between him and the workman whereby the later has given up all his claims in consideration of his re-employment by the former as a casual coolie on the condition that he shall be at liberty to terminate his services in case of want of sufficient work to absorb the workman.

Shri Panna Lal in *ex parte* evidence made his statement, thereby proving the written settlement Ex. M. 1 as duly signed by the workman at mark 'A'. I see no reason to disbelieve his statement particularly when the proceedings against the workman are *ex parte*.

I, therefore, relying upon the statement of Shri Panna Lal hold that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement whereby the workman has relinquished all his claims under this reference and there is now no dispute between the parties. I as such return a no dispute award. There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated the 12th August, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 1924, dated the 14th August, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

The 28th August, 1975

No. 9421-4Lab-75/26755. — In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Auto Metal and Auto Agro Engineers, Plot No. 5, N.I.T., Faridabad. —

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 65 of 1974

between

SHRI JAIUDIN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S AUTO METAL AND AUTO  
AGRO ENGINEERS, PLOT No. 5, N.I.T., FARIDABAD

Present. —

Nemo, for the workmen.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

#### AWARD

By Order No. ID/FD/74/13490, dated 18th May, 1974, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Auto Metal and Auto Agro Engineers, Plot No. 5, N.I.T., Faridabad and its workman Shri Jaiudin to this Tribunal, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jaiudin was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference having been issued for service on the parties, the workmen through his legal representative Shri R. L. Sharma filed a statement of claim alleging inter alia that his service had been terminated without proper enquiry and opportunity given to him to show cause against the proposed punishment.

The management of M/s Auto Agro Industries through Shri R. C. Sharma, their authorised representative,— vide written reply stated that the description of the management as found given in the demand notice and the reference, by the name and style of M/s Auto Metal and Auto Agro Engineers was incorrect and that in fact there were two firms one by the name of Auto Metal Engineers and the other by the name and style of M/s Auto Agro Industries and that each had been managed separately, having no connection with the other. They thus pleaded that the reference made between Jaiudin and the management of M/s Auto Agro Engineers was illegal.

The management pleaded that Shri Jaiudin workman had in fact resigned from service of M/s Auto Agro Industries on 8th November, 1973 and that the demand made by him on the management that the services had been illegally terminated was unjustified. The following issues were framed on the pleas of the parties.—vide my learned predecessor Shri Om Parkash Sharma, the then Presiding Officer of the Industrial Tribunal :—

- (1) Whether the description of the respondent concern has been wrongly given in the order of reference? If so, with what effect? (on management)
- (2) Whether Shri Jaiudin workman concerned has tendered his resignation on 9th November, 1973 to his employer and the same was duly accepted and therefore, the present case is not covered by section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act? (on management)
- (3) Whether the termination of services of Shri Jaiudin was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The workman and his representative were absent today despite being directed to appear and pursue the case, *ex parte* proceedings were taken against them. I decide the issue as under:—

*Issue No. 1.*—The respondent examined Shri Murli Manohar, Time-keeper of M/s Agro Industries, who deposed that there was no firm in existence by the name and style of M/s Auto Metal and Auto Agro Engineers as impleaded by the workman in his notice of demand and that there were in fact two firms one by the name and style of Auto Metal Engineers and the other by the name and style of M/s Auto Agro Industries. He made a statement with reference to the record brought by him. His statement is found corroborated by the letter head Exhibit M. 3 bearing the description Auto Agro Industries. I see no reason to disbelieve him particularly when the same had remained unrebutted and unassailed. I therefore, placing full reliance on his evidence, decide this issue in favour of the management.

*Issue No. 2.*—The respondent in order to establish their case relied on the resignation Exhibit M. 5 of Jaiudin and a complaint made by the latter before the Labour Inspector bearing his admission that he had submitted his resignation. Shri Brihma Nand Organiser, Labour Officer Exhibit M. W. 1 proved the copy Exhibit M. 1 as correct of the original complaint received in the office of the Labour Inspector. The copy Exhibit M. 1 discloses as bearing admission of the workman in respect of his having tendered his resignation. Shri Murli Manohar deposed that he had seen Jaiudin signing often and that his resignation Exhibit M. 5 bore his signatures which he could identify well.

The statement of Brihma Nand and Murli Manohar having remained unrebutted and unassailed placing full reliance on the same holding this issue in favour of the management with a finding that the workman submitted his resignation on 8th November, 1973 and that it had been duly accepted and the reference was not covered by section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

*Issue No. 3.*—In view of my finding on issue No. 2 this issue required no decision in as much as the question of termination of services of Shri Jaiudin does not arise under the circumstances.

I as a result of finding on the aforesaid issue hold that the services of the workman were never terminated and that he resigned from service of his own accord on 8th November, 1973 and as such is not entitled to any relief. The reference stands answered accordingly.

Dated 11th August, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 1380, dated 11th August, 1975

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated 11th August, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.